

Third Edition;

S P E E C H

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE

JOHN BERESFORD,

ON HIS MOVING

THE SIXTH ARTICLE OF THE

U N I O N

IN THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS OF IRELAND,

MARCH 19th, 1800.

DUBLIN:

PRINTED FOR J. MILLIKEN, 32, GRAFTON-STREET.

1800.

Printed by

33

RIGHT MONOPOLY

JOHN W. ARK 33020

OF THE

THE STATE OF THE

08-563

UNION

IN THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS OF IRELAND

1800

1811

PRINTED BY J. MURPHY, 12, GREAT ST. STREET

1830

S P E E C H, &c.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, MARCH 19, 1800.

THE subject before the Committee has had a most full and patient investigation, such as its very high importance calls for: In what I shall offer on this occasion, I shall endeavour to state matters as they appear to me, fairly and candidly; and I hope I shall not be induced, by the favourable opinion I have of a LEGISLATIVE UNION between the two countries, to advance any thing inconsistent with the interests of my own.

The sixth article of the proposed Union, which is the present object of deliberation, contains those resolutions that relate to the future commercial arrangement between Great Britain and Ireland. In my first statement of this business, I observed that the present system had been formed on the principles of the Commercial Treaty in 1785, but that it went farther, and gave greater benefits to this country than the former.

The propositions of 1785 stand upon record.

Those resolutions passed this house upon the 12th of February, 1785; they stand upon your Journals, and shew what it was the Commons of Ireland desired. They were

B

taken

taken into consideration by the Houses of Parliament in Great Britain, and several alterations made in them.

A Bill was brought into this House for carrying this system into effect. This Bill was twice read, ordered to be printed, and remains on record in your office. It has been drawn with great care and attention. I was at that time in London, corresponding with the Cabinet here, and negotiating, under their direction, with the Ministers of Great Britain upon the subject of these propositions, as my Right Hon. Friend, on the other side of the House, well knows.

My correspondence at that time informed me, that this Bill was not drawn in the ordinary manner, but by the hands of the most EFFICIENT MEN in that cabinet; and having lately made enquiry after the original draft of it, I have seen it, and observed it to have been corrected throughout, in a hand-writing well known and familiar to me.

The committee appointed to bring in this bill were, Mr. Orde, then Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, my Right Hon. Friend, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, the noble Lord who now presides in the High Court of Chancery, then Attorney General, and myself; and when opposed upon the second reading, it was most ably supported by those, who had originally prepared it.

It is unnecessary for me to press this matter farther. The debate, as printed by Mr. Woodfall, is in every man's hands. The Publick know well who supported it, and what was said on the occasion. My reason for going so far is, to shew that this bill was sanctioned by the cabinet of that day, and supported by those able members of that cabinet, who had prepared it.

Having stated these two records, first, the resolutions of the 12th Feb. 1785, which contained the desire of this house; and secondly, the bill which was to have carried the ultimate plan into effect, I shall proceed to shew that the present

present system is more advantageous than that which was desired by those resolutions, and much more so than that which was intended to have been carried into execution by the bill.

The difference between the two systems is, that in that of 1785, prohibitions upon certain articles were allowed to remain; whereas in that now before us, all prohibitions, prohibitory duties, and bounties upon all articles, the growth, produce or manufacture of either country, are to be taken away, and they are to be reciprocally imported and exported by either country, without any bounty or duty, except in the case of those imported into Ireland, and enumerated by a schedule upon which certain duties are imposed, as a protection to the manufactures of this country.

To prove the justness of the statement I have made, I shall refer in the first instance to the Irish propositions, as they passed the House of Commons of Ireland at the above-mentioned period.

The first Resolution was merely prefatory, stating that the trade between the two countries should be encouraged and extended as much as possible, and finally settled and regulated on equitable principles, for the mutual benefit of both countries.

The second Resolution went to regulate the trade between Great Britain and Ireland, in colonial produce, by giving a like construction to the Navigation Law in both countries. This having been settled in 1793, I shall pass it over.

The third Resolution runs thus:

“Resolved, That for the same purpose, it is proper that
 “no prohibition should exist in either country against the
 “importation, use, or sale of any article, the growth,
 “product or manufacture of the other; and that the duty
 “on the importation of any such article, if subject to duty
 “in either country, should be precisely the same in one
 “country,

“ country, as in the other, except where an addition may
 “ be necessary in either country, in consequence of an in-
 “ ternal duty, on any such article of its own consumption.”

Now what is the extent of this resolution?

It relates to imports only. It opens the ports of each kingdom to the importation which the other may chuse to make into it, and for that purpose it takes away all prohibitions against *importing* any article of the growth, produce or manufacture of either country into the other; and it gives the markets of each to the use and sale of the other; but it does not touch upon *exportation* at all, and it leaves all those prohibitions which were then in force for the prevention of the exportation of raw martials, from either country to the other. But how did those prohibitions operate? why, entirely against Ireland!

By the laws of Ireland, as they then stood, all manner of goods could be imported from Britain into this country; and in general at lower duties than from other parts of the world; but by the laws of England many direct prohibitions existed to prevent the import of our manufactures into Great Britain, and the export of certain articles of their raw materials to us: the former were removed by this resolution, but the latter were all retained.

The fourth Resolution I shall remark on hereafter.

The fifth Resolution relates merely to countervailing duties, which are regulated exactly upon the same principles in both systems.

By the sixth Proposition of the Irish Parliament, it is resolved:

“ That, in order to give permanency to the settlement
 “ now intended to be established, it is necessary that no pro-
 “ hibition, or new, or additional duties, should be *hereafter*
 “ imposed in either kingdom, on importation of any articles
 “ of the growth, produce or manufacture of the other,
 “ except

“ except such additional duties as may be requisite to
 “ counter-balance duties on internal consumption pursuant
 “ to the foregoing Resolution.”

But what, Sir, did this resolution do? only, that as the third resolution had taken away the prohibition which existed against the importation of certain articles from Ireland into Britain; this resolution went to prevent any new prohibition, or new or additional duties from being *hereafter* imposed on importation of articles, the growth, product or manufacture of either country into the other: but it left us just where we were before, in relation to all the prohibitions, which at that time existed on the exportation of raw materials from Britain; and also, left us subject to the existing duties.

The seventh Resolution indeed comes to Exportation. But to what does it extend? Why, it says:

“ That for the same purpose, it is necessary, farther,
 “ that no prohibition, or new or additional duties should
 “ be *hereafter* imposed in either kingdom on the exporta-
 “ tion of any articles of native growth, produce or ma-
 “ facture from the one to the other, except such as either
 “ kingdom may deem expedient from time to time, upon
 “ corn, meal, malt, flour and biscuits; and also, except
 “ where there now exists any prohibition, which is not
 “ reciprocal, or any duty which is not equal in both king-
 “ doms; in every which case, the prohibitions may be
 “ made reciprocal, or the duties raised, so as to make them
 “ equal.”

Now what did this resolution do? Why it ordained that no *new* prohibition or *new* or additional duties should be imposed on the exportation of the articles of either country, to the other; but, like the foregoing Resolution, it likewise left all prohibitions, *existing at that time*, just where they were. Now there being none in Ireland against
 Britain,

Britain, and many in Britain against Ireland, this resolution gave us no manner of advantage. Indeed the latter part of the resolution allowed us to put reciprocal prohibitions, and to lay reciprocal prohibitory duties where such existed in Britain; but that was mere mockery, for we had not the raw materials to send out, and therefore we could not gain any thing by prohibiting the exportation of them.

How was the equitable principle, and mutual benefit stated in the first resolution carried into execution by these resolutions, in which were left all the existing prohibitions against the exportation of British materials of manufacture, and in which power was given to Ireland to lay on prohibitions, or prohibitory duties in return, on articles which she had not to export.

The eighth Resolution took away bounties between the countries, which is fully done in the present system.

The ninth Resolution I shall observe upon hereafter.

The tenth and eleventh relate to contribution, not to commerce.

This was the result of the Irish Propositions of 1785.

Now what does the present system propose?

The first Resolution of the sixth article sets out by putting the two countries upon the exact same footing, as to encouragements and bounties on all articles the growth, produce or manufacture of either; thereby securing to us, the bounties and encouragements on linen and sail-cloth.

It goes on and gives us the same encouragements and bounties in respect of trade and navigation in all ports and places of the united kingdom, or its dependencies; thereby securing to us for ever the trade of all the British Colonies, and upon the same terms as England.

And then it gives us the benefit of all British treaties.

The second and third Resolutions go to the very root of the evil, by directly, and at once, abolishing all bounties, prohibitions

prohibitions and duties between the two countries, laying open the trade, ports and markets of each to the other, fully and completely, not only in manufactures, but in raw materials.

Can any man seriously think, whatever he may say, that there are no advantages gained by Ireland from a system of this nature, which obtains for us the free use of the raw materials of Britain, secured to us for ever; such as coals, hops, bark, wool, fullers earth, fullers clay, tobacco pipe clay, hare and rabbit skins, &c. &c. &c.? Can any man really believe that the use of British wool can be of no advantage to the wool-comber, the spinner of wool, the weaver, and the whole manufacture of woollens?

Is it not a well known fact, that although wool was cheaper in England than in Ireland, yet that our yarn was much cheaper in Britain than they could spin it for, owing to our labour being so much lower than theirs? If then we get nothing but the spinning of the wool, we should be considerable gainers; the value of yarn being one-third of the value of the manufacture.

By the evidence of a Norwich manufacturer, given before the Lords of trade in 1785, it appeared that our yarn was 12 and a half per cent. cheaper in the market of Norwich than the English.

If then our yarn be 12 and a half per cent. cheaper in Norwich, (which is one of the most distant parts of England from our coasts,) than English yarn; can any man doubt but that we should gain exceedingly by this branch of the manufacture, if we carried it no further.

We work up all our own wool, and import much old drapery; if we can obtain wool, we shall probably work it up, as we do our own, to ultimate perfection.

But it has been attempted to be proved, that wool is so bulky

bulky a commodity, that it cannot bear the expence of carriage.

It that be true, Sir, I beg to know, for what purpose have all the laws, both in England and in Ireland, against the exportation of wool been made?

But to put this matter out of doubt, I need only mention, that it appears from our custom-house books, that the fair annual export of wool from this country to Britain, soon after the act of 10th Wm. III. ch. 10. passed, was upon an average no less than 361,491 great stones at 18lb. besides the great quantities which are known to have been smuggled to France in those days.

Again, Sir, can any man even pretend to believe that it is no advantage to Ireland, to have the ports of Britain open to all those fabricks of wool and mohair, wool and silk, &c. such as poplins, tabinets, bombazines, luterines, &c. &c. in which it is acknowledged that we surpass all the world?

Having shewn that the system now under consideration is more advantageous than that of the resolutions passed in our parliament in 1785, I shall next advert to the bill brought into parliament for the purpose of carrying the commercial propositions into execution.

Sir, the fourth clause of this bill did enact, that where the duties in the two countries differ, that they should be reduced in that country in which they were highest to an amount not exceeding the duties as they stood in the other, on the 17th day of May 1782,—so that where any article paid 10½ per cent. on that day, it should not pay less than 10½ thereafter.

This clause certainly differed from the fourth resolution of the Irish parliament; in this, that the resolution states
 “that in all cases where the duties on articles of the growth,
 “product or manufacture of either country are different on
 “the importation into the other, it would be expedient
 “that

“ that they should be reduced in the kingdom where they
“ are the highest to the amount payable in the other.”

This resolution passed on the 12th of Feb. 1785, and refers to the duties as they stood on that day: the clause in the bill refers to the duties as they stood upon the 17th May 1782.

Now let us see, what were the duties upon unrated goods at these two periods?

On the 17th of May 1782, all unrated goods are subject to a duty in custom of £ 5 0 0
And in excise of 5 0 0

Making 10 0 0

From which was deducted at the rate of s.

5 per cent. in the customs, or 5

And 6 per cent. in the excise, or 6

Total - 0 11 0

Remains nett duty 9 9 0

And there was an additional duty on muslin of
per yard 0 0 6

Between the 17th May 1782 and 25th Dec. 1783, these duties were altered in the first place, by taking away the allowances of 5 and 6 per cent. which brought the duties to £ 10 0 0

And in the second place, by imposing 5 per cent.
upon the duties, or 0 10 0

The duties then stood at 10 10 0

This last duty of 5 per cent. on the duties, was laid on in the Linen Bill, and was a fund for the payment of the bounties granted in that Bill, upon the export of linens, &c. And thus they stood until the consolidation of duties in 1791. There was also in the Money Bill which passed the 23d Dec. 1783, an additional duty imposed on calicos of per
C yard

yard 6d. by inserting, for the first time, the word calico after the word muslin.

The duties were then on the 12th Feb. 1783, on all unrated goods, except

Muslins and calicos	-	-	£ 10 10 0
and on muslins and calicos	-	-	10 10 0
and per yard	-	-	0 1 6

The Resolution therefore of 12th Feb. 1785, alluded to the duties just stated.

The Bill alluded to the duty of £ 9 9 0

The cause of going back to the 17th May, 1782, I have already mentioned to the Committee.

The British Parliament having, upon the 17th May, 1782, come to two resolutions in consequence of the arrangements which were then about to be made between the two countries:

And the Parliament of Ireland, having, between that period and the agitation of the Commercial Propositions in England, raised the duties, as before stated, the Parliament of Britain thought it fair and just to refer back to the period at which they began the treaty, and take the duties which existed at that day.

Had this bill, as brought into the House of Commons, been passed into a law, the consequence would have been, that the general protecting duty given by it to all unrated goods, calicos included, would have been but £ 9 9 0 per cent. above a half per cent. less than the duty now offered; and had the resolutions as voted, passed into a law, the protection would have been only £ 10 10, or $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. above the general duty offered.

But it was the bill which would have ascertained the duty, and not the resolutions. I therefore trust I have shewn that the present system is more advantageous than that of 1785, inasmuch as that of 1785 neglected to se-

cure

sure exportation, and thereby lost us the raw materials of Britain, and did not procure us the importation of our manufactures mixed with wool. And inasmuch as the duties desired by the resolutions were but $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. higher than the present protection, while that which would have been granted, was more than $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. below the duties of protection contained in the present system.

The first Resolution of these articles secures to us the benefit of all treaties, a thing not touched on by the propositions of 1785.

By the sixth Resolution of these articles, all duties on foreign goods exported are to be drawn back, or if retained, are to be put to the account of the country to which exported.

This is highly advantageous to Ireland, who exports little of foreign goods to Britain, while she receives her supply of such goods, almost wholly through Britain; so that the duties would be advanced by the English merchant for his correspondent in Ireland.

This system of retaining the duty, and placing it to the account of the importing country, saves the expence and trouble of recovering drawbacks, a thing very advantageous to trade.

So that taking this present system, as compared either with the resolutions of 1785, as they passed this House, or with the Bill, as then brought in, it must appear that the present system is much more advantageous.

It has been said that the present system, by lowering the duties to 10 per cent. would operate injuriously on 70 articles of manufacture, and would ruin entirely the cotton business. I must observe on this, that in the list which I have seen of those 70 articles, the greater part of them now stand at a duty of £ 12 14 1 $\frac{1}{2}$; that they stood in

1785 at a duty of £ 10 10——that in 1782, they stood at a duty of but £ 9 9.

That they were raised in the manner before mentioned from £ 9 9 to £ 10 10. Ten Pounds of which was Hereditary Revenue, and ten shillings appropriated to the linen manufacture.

In 1791, the whole was consolidated, and then the duty stood at - - - - - £ 10 10 0

In the sessions of 1797, an additional duty was laid on the existing duties of £ 10 per cent.

making the duty - - - - - 11 11 0

And in 1799, a further £ 10 per cent. making 12 14 1½

The duty in 1783, except upon calicos, was laid not as a protecting duty, but as a fund to pay the linen bounty outwards; and the two 10 per cents. in 1797 and 1799, were laid on expressly for the purpose of raising revenue, and not as protecting duties.

Of the 70 manufactures therefore pretended to be injured by this reduction, none can fairly complain, except the manufacturers of muslins and calicos.

I desire to know how did 69 of those manufactures exist, before the year 1783, under a protection of £ 9 9 0? and how were they carried on from 1783 to 1797, under a protection of £ 10 10?

I have now explained the operation of the resolutions, and the Bill of 1785, and of the present system, and have shewn that they proceeded upon the same principles; viz. the giving a moderate protecting duty to the manufacturers of the weaker country.

It has been said that the resolutions of 1785, reduced the duties on importation of the articles of gross produce or manufacture, from one kingdom into the other, where they were higher in one, to the amount payable in the other; and that as our duties were almost universally lower,

“ every

“ every protection given by the duty to our manufactures
 “ remained ; but the present terms declare that every duty
 “ existing in Ireland on British manufacture, is either to be
 “ reduced immediately to ten per cent. or totally to cease.”

Now all this is very true ; but in order to determine whether the inference intended to be drawn from it is equally well founded, let us examine how the facts stand. What would have been the protecting duty under the act had it passed ? What would it have been under the resolutions ? and what will it be under the present system ?

Under the act it would have been - £ 9 9 0

Under the resolutions - - - 10 10 0

And by the present system it will be - 10 0 0

The duty under the resolutions was one half per cent. higher than the duties now proposed ; but as the duties in the Bill, were to have been the law, they would have been more than one-half per cent. lower than the duties now proposed.

The article next mentioned was apparel. This article it is said, “ will be reduced from 12*l.* 14*s.* 1*d.* British to
 “ ten per cent. and its import has rapidly increased under
 “ the larger duties.”

In the first place, the duty existing is in no instance 12*l.* 14*s.* 1*d.* British. It is 12*l.* 14*s.* 1*d.* Irish on 100*l.* Irish ; the duties are in some of the accounts laid before the House computed in British money ; but if the per centage is struck in British currency, it is upon 100*l.* British,—equivalent exactly to 10 per cent. on 100*l.* Irish ; but by the manner in which this is stated, people would be led to suppose that the duty was 12*l.* 14*s.* 1*d.* per cent. British on 100*l.* Irish, which would be 13*l.* 15*s.* 3*d.* per cent.

What is the apparel which is imported ? Nothing but soldiers clothing ; the apparel of the army ;—and it is not very strange, that the quantity lately imported should be

more

more than it was formerly, notwithstanding the protecting duty.

The next article which is to be injured is copper wrought, of which it is confessed that we import but little; however it is said we know not how far the removing the present protection of 2*l.* 14*s.* 1*d.* British, may increase it.

Here again the mistake of British money is introduced as if the per centage was 12*l.* 14*s.* 1*d.* British, or 13*l.* 15*s.* 3*d.* Irish on 100*l.* Irish.

As to the fear of an inundation of wrought copper pouring in upon us by the removal of this duty of 2*l.* 14*s.* 1½*d.* I am only to state that 2*l.* 4*s.* 1*d.* of it is but just put on, and that while the duty stood even at 9*l.* 9*s.* very little wrought copper was imported here.

The same answer will suffice for glass, haberdashery, hats, hardware, millinery, &c. &c.

As to the saddlery, which is said to have increased rapidly, the increase, I must observe, is owing to the wants of the army and the horse yeomanry. Leather and stained paper will be subject to ten per cent. and also to a countervailing duty.

The next article is silk, and on this subject we have had a minute investigation, and examination of witnesses; I shall therefore, Sir, in due time, advert to their evidence.

Silk stockings have been mentioned, and it has been said, "Will gentlemen believe that silk stockings now pay an import duty of 4*s.* 8*d.* a pair, and by the reduction of duty to 10*l.* per cent. will pay only 1*s.* a pair?" and then it is said, "Need I ask, what will become of our hosiers?"

It is indeed needless to ask, since it is well known that they will remain just where they are, if they be not advantaged.

The duty upon silk stockings is as stated 4*s.* 8*d.* a pair, upon the value of 12*s.* (above 40 per cent.) and the consequence is, that, like all very exorbitant duties on articles of
easy

easy conveyance, it defeats itself, and no duty is paid. The whole produce of this duty is not £100 a year; and yet every gentleman who hears me well knows that $\frac{2}{3}$ of the silk stockings worn in Ireland are British: How is then the hosiery protected by a duty which cannot be collected? Of what use is such a duty to him? I will tell the Committee: it enables the hosiery to charge the publick with an exorbitant price for the silk stockings he sells; which he charges with the duty he certainly does not pay, and that is the reason why every gentleman who hears me, finds that he is obliged to pay 4 or 5s. a pair more for silk stockings in Ireland, than he can buy them for in Britain, although the raw material is so much cheaper in Ireland.

It is also stated that "the ninth Resolution of 1785, " provided for an effectual preference in each kingdom " against similar articles from foreign States, thereby " strengthening the security for the Irish linens against the " foreign in the British markets." These Resolutions are wholly silent on that head.

In the treaty of 1783, where two *distinct* kingdoms were settling a commercial intercourse, it was very proper and necessary to enter into such an arrangement. But in the present case, where the two kingdoms are about to unite and to become *one* kingdom with *one* Parliament, composed of the representatives of *both* countries, such a proposition would be ridiculous. It would be to have a Resolution of the present Parliament, that a future Parliament should protect us against foreign States. We are by the first Resolution entitled to the *same* privileges, are to be on the *same* footing as to encouragement and bounties, and generally in respect of trade and navigation as Great Britain. Every preference therefore which she gives herself over foreign States we must enjoy. We have therefore nothing to fear

on this head; and such a Resolution in this system would therefore be ridiculous.

Iron is an object looked to on this occasion. But surely there is nothing in the present system which operates to our disadvantage in the importation of iron.

At present American iron comes in duty free; all other iron pays 12s. 6d. a ton. Iron is not in the schedule; of course English iron will be imported duty free; and as this system does not affect *foreign* trade, the duty on all other iron will remain as it now stands.

Raw silk also not being either a growth or product of Britain, will stand at the present duties.

It is objected that hops, salt, and coal are, under the present resolution, to continue for ever subject to the present duties on import into Ireland.

This was never intended, and will be remedied by the manner in which I shall move the resolution.

The greater part of the duty on hops was, as has been stated, laid on by compact with Great Britain on the taking off the excise she had on its export; which was a tax paid by us who consumed it. We laid on a duty equal to that which they took off. This we were bound in honour to do; but there is no reason why we should not leave open to the united Parliament to reduce the duty if it should be found expedient; and therefore I shall alter the present phrase in this case, and that of salt in this manner, *viz.*

“Salt and hops on importation into Ireland, duties not exceeding those now paid in Ireland; and coals on importation to be subject to burthens not exceeding those to which they are now subject.”

Salt was inserted in the manner it appears in the schedule, in order to bring English salt under the salt duty; for it being a manufacture of Britain, if it had not been enumerated in the schedule, it would have come in duty free; while
bay

bay salt would have paid 4*l.* per ton, and rock salt from which we manufacture our own white salt, 3*l.* per ton.

The next article mentioned is sail cloth : and it is asserted that some part of the disadvantages under which this manufacture laboured, has been already done away, and that therefore only part of the injurious regulations of this trade is now removed. Be it so ; it appears however that we are advantaged by whatever is now removed, and that is what I had to prove.

The liberality of the free import of wool is acknowledged, and that this advantage was not in the Propositions of 1785.

The value of this is however endeavoured to be lessened ; but I hope and believe that this country will soon be convinced of its utility, as well as of the various articles, and raw materials of that branch of manufacture heretofore withheld from us, as fullers earth, fulling clay, &c.

Linseed oil is the next article stated, and it is said that the duty now payable, was imposed to encourage the growth of Irish flax-seed, by affording a market for such Irish seed as might not be fit for sowing, and by the application of the duty, received in premiums, for growing flax-seed, and that the present system does away all this.

The present system relates merely to the trade between Britain and Ireland, and can affect only the linseed oil of Britain. Now it is a well known fact, that it was Holland which, until the commencement of the present war, always supplied us with linseed oil ; and that we pay now to Great Britain nearly a double price for that article, which shews, in the first place, that the trade will fall back to Holland as soon as we shall have peace ; or that if it does not, that the price being advanced to double, is a better protection and encouragement to our mills than the now existing duty

The average export from England for the	Gallons.
last 3 years to 1799, was	- - - 17,924
And from other parts	- - - 13,138
	The



The average from England for three years before the war to 1793, was	-	-	-	Gallons.
And from other parts	-	-	-	1950
				31,092

The average from England for three years to 1793, was	-	-	-	1051
And from other parts	-	-	-	33,995

The average from England for three years to 1781, was	-	-	-	2035
And from other parts	-	-	-	37,786

So that on three periods of peace with Holland, the proportion of oil from England, was not 1-20th of the importation.

My Right Hon. Friend has summed up and recapitulated his comparison of the present system with that of 1785, by stating "That these commercial regulations lower all protecting duties above ten per cent. to ten per cent. and remove all others; operating thereby injuriously on 70 articles of manufacture, and ruining entirely the cotton business. The propositions passed by this House in 1785, reduced none and preserved them all."

To this I answer, that my Right Hon. Friend very artfully states every thing upon the Propositions, as they passed this House in February, 1785, because he knows that they gave a protection of one half per cent. more than the present system; but I must bring him back to the *Bill* which he himself had so great a share in preparing, and so ably supported in this House, (and which was to have carried these Propositions into law,) in which the protection was more than one-half per cent. below the present.

I have already, more than once, stated that the protection by the <i>Bill</i> , was	-	-	-	£ 9 9 0
By the Propositions of 1785	-	-	-	10 10 0
And by the present system	-	-	-	10 0 0
				Now,

Now, Sir, I desire my Right Hon. Friend to compare even 10*l.* 10*s.* with the protection desired by the evidence of the cotton manufacturers which he has produced, and then tell me, whether, if it require 50 per cent. to protect their manufacture, it would not be as effectually ruined by a duty of 10*l.* 10*s.* as by one of 10*l.*? In like manner, if the silk manufacture require, as is now alledged, 25 per cent. protection, how would it have stood protected by 10½ in 1785?

This holds equally with the remainder of his 70 articles. They stood protected in 1785, by 10*l.* 10*s.* and the wants of the state in the last two years have added two ten per cents. on the duties, so that they now stand protected by 12*l.* 14*s.* 1*d.* Will he tell me, that this increased duty was meant by the wisdom of parliament to be a further protection to those 70 articles, and that it was not the wants of the state which imposed those duties?

He next states "that the present system does not secure
" a preference for linen, or any article in the British market,
" against foreign produce, and that the Propositions did."

The answer I have already given is conclusive—namely, that the Propositions were between two distinct kingdoms. The present system is a consolidation of these two kingdoms into one. When this is completed, there will be no distinction of markets; the markets of London, Bristol, York, &c. will be as much the market of Ireland as that of Dublin, Cork, Waterford, or Derry; and to stipulate that Ireland should have a preference in *her own* market, would be ridiculous.

He then states, that "these terms make perpetual new
" and excessive duties upon salt, and render those on hops
" and coals unalterable."

I have

I have already said that no such thing is intended; and, to prevent all cavil, I shall alter the words of the Resolution.

He then states, that "the present terms leave our brewery unprotected, allowing only a countervailing duty, as if our excise on beer continued, which is another instance of want of Irish information in England. The Propositions of 1785 left the *existing* protection."

It might be better perhaps to postpone any argument on this subject until the countervailing duty came to be considered: I shall, however, give a short detail of the present protecting duty upon beer.

In the year 1783, the duty on the import of beer was

The duty on our own beer was then

Mr. Pelham was then secretary: I prevailed on him to add to the import duty which with the

made a duty exactly equal to our excise, or

This was done on the express compact and principle, that the import duty and the inland excise should be always the same: leaving the expences attending the bringing in beer as a protection to our brewery, which was estimated at full 3s. a barrel.

Our excise and the import duty remained at, or equal until 1791

When the excise was lowered to
Malt duty paid by ale
Hop duty

Total excise in 1791
And in this year the import duty was

Thus

Thus they stood until 1795, when all excise duty was taken off beer. There then remained on beer the hop duty, viz. - - - - - 0 3

And the excise on malt, viz. - - - - - 2 7½

Total duty paid on our beer - - - - - 2 10½

And imported beer paid - - - - - 4 3½

In 1798, the malt duty was raised, and our beer paid - - - - - 3 3

The duty on imported beer was raised to - - - - - 6 1½

In 1799, the malt duty was raised, and our beer paid - - - - - 3 6

Imported beer also paid - - - - - 7 1½

Thus it appears that we departed from the principle, which we ourselves had established, when in 1783 we got the import duty raised, so as to equal our excise. As the malt duty increased, we raised our import duty in proportion; but as our excise decreased, we did not lower the import duty in proportion. We also added two ten per cents. on those duties.

Now what says my Right Hon. Friend? that the propositions left the *then existing* protection? I ask him, what was that in 1785?

Equal duties, excise and import being each 4s. 1d. what will the present countervailing duty do?

It will leave the import duty at 4s. 6d. equal to the duty paid upon malt and hops, the only duties now payable by our beer.

This duty is struck on 9 stone of malt and 3 lb. of hops to 40 gallons, which would make 5s. 7½d. or on 32 gallons 4s. 6d.

The

The next assertion is, that "the present system makes no provision as to retaining our low duties on the import of raw materials; the Propositions of 1785 did."

Now what is the fact? the Propositions of 1785, left every prohibition existing upon British raw materials; the present system removes them all.

Any other than British raw materials are not at all concerned in the system.

Thus I have endeavoured to follow the arguments which have been used; and I trust I have shewn that the system is in every respect more advantageous than the Propositions; and that the manufactures of this country are not likely to suffer more from it than from the Propositions, the favourite system of my Right Hon. Friend.

I am conscious that I have taken up too much of the time of the House; but as every thing which falls from the Right Hon. Gentleman must carry much weight with it, I thought it necessary to follow him minutely through his detail.

I come now to those articles of trade upon which gentlemen seem to have founded their firmest reliance. They have examined witnesses to shew that the present system must destroy the sugar, the iron, the silk, and the cotton manufactures. Before I go into these subjects, I must beg leave to state that in a commercial arrangement to be made between two countries about to unite and mould themselves into one empire, equal in every part, and in every respect, having one and the same King, one and the same Parliament, one and the same Interests, Prosperity and Adversity, the true principle would be, that all articles, the growth, produce or manufacture of either, should pass into the other, free from all bounties or duties, just as they would go coastways in the country which produced them; and that all taxes and duties in both countries should be the same.

This

This would be indispensable, were the two countries on an equal footing of prosperity at the outset; but where one country is advanced before the other, it may be reasonable to depart for a certain time from the strict principle in favour of the weaker sister; but in so doing, we are bound to keep in view, and to adhere as nearly as possible to the spirit of this principle.

There are certain bounds beyond which it would be ridiculous to carry protection in a united empire. Can any man assert, that in such an empire, any part of it ought to carry on a trade or manufacture, which another part of the same empire can bring to market, 20, 30, 40 or 50 per cent. cheaper; or is it reasonable or right that a great proportion of the people should be obliged to encourage a manufacture, by paying on their consumption from 20 to 50 per cent. more than they could purchase the same articles for, if such high duties were not laid on them?

Such duties pervade the whole manufactures of a country, and bring them dearer to market in proportion to the additional tax, imposed upon the man who makes them, in favour of the protected manufacture.

For instance—The weaver of linen wears coat, waistcoat, breeches and stockings, and his wife and family must be dressed: if then you make him pay 50 per cent. for the materials of which those dresses are made, he must obtain that overcharge by increasing the price of his own fabric, and he must therefore charge a higher price for his linen; and the man who buys his linen at an advanced price, must bring that back by charging what he sells at an advanced price; and so it goes through all manufactures.

It is therefore reasonable that, while protection is afforded to certain articles, that protection should be limited to a moderate per centage, and for a reasonable time.

Ten per cent. is what is proposed in general, and in a
very

very few instances more will be given, in consideration of certain circumstances.

These are the principles of the present system; these were the principles of the Propositions in 1785.

The then per centage, according to the Resolutions, was	-	-	-	£. 10 10 0
By the Bill	-	-	-	9 9 0
We now stand between both	-	-	-	10 0 0

I have troubled you so long, that I shall not go into arguments to shew the evil effects of prohibitory duties and monopolies. Those who come after me will probably take that ground.

I shall proceed to observe upon the sugar trade in the first instance.

When the free trade to the colonies was granted, the duty on raw sugar in Great Britain was in Irish money	-	-	-	£. 0 7 2½
--	---	---	---	-----------

In Ireland	-	-	-	1 8
We laid on a duty to equalize of	-	-	-	5 6½
				7 2½

The great object of this law was a direct trade to the colonies.

Therefore this additional duty to equalize was laid as well on the sugar coming through Britain, as on that coming directly from the West Indies.

This made it necessary, in consequence of the additional duty on the raw material, to lay an equivalent duty on the manufactured or refined sugar imported. The refiners in England had at that time a bounty on the exportation of their refined sugar, *more* than equal to the duty paid upon the raw material, from which it was made. This, if it had not been countervailed, must have enabled them to overturn our refinery. The question then was, what the duty should be

be, which must be laid upon British refined sugar, to countervail this bounty.

There were great variety of opinions upon this subject, and there were proposed by gentlemen 5s. 10½*d.*—9s. 4½*d.* 11s. 1*d.*—12s.—and 16s. 7½*d.* I held an opinion different from all these, and insisted that 3s. 4½*d.* was the true equalizing duty. I founded this opinion on this plain idea, that if the duty payable upon the importation of refined sugar, was exactly equal to the bounty or drawback given in Britain, upon the export, then that the sugar would come in just as if there was neither bounty on the export, or duty on the import; and then as the duty on the raw sugar was exactly the same in both countries, the refiners of both would be exactly upon the same footing.

Now the bounty on refined sugar from Britain, being at that time in Irish money

£ 0 15 8½

And the duty in Ireland being

12 4

The sum necessary to equalize the duty was

- 3 4½

15 8½

The House were of a different opinion, and the sum that was laid on in addition to

- 12 4

Was

- 9 2½

Making

- 1 1 6½

And in 1783, this 9s. 2½*d.* was raised to

0 12 0

Which being added to the original duty of

0 12 4

Made

- 1 4 4

This heavy duty was laid, in consequence of an assertion that the quantity of raw sugar necessary to make 100 wt. of refined, was 300 wt.; and that a duty at least equivalent to that put upon 300 wt. of raw sugar, ought to be added to the duty then existing upon refined sugar; and it was then argued, that 200 wt. of raw sugar, was not sufficient to

E

make

make 100 wt. of refined, as appeared by the proportion of drawback allowed in Britain, which exceeded the amount of the duty paid upon 200 wt. of the raw sugar.

But it will appear from the duties and drawbacks laid on and given at different periods on raw and refined sugar in Britain, that the proportion of raw to refined, was always 2 to 1.

An account of the several duties imposed upon sugar, in its raw state, on importation into Britain.	An account of the several allowances given upon the exportation of refined sugar from Great Britain.
By the 12 Cha. 2. ch. 4. - - 1 6	No drawbk. was given for this duty.
By the 9 & 10 Will. 3. ch. 2. 3. 1 6	Allowance for 100 wt. by this } 3 0
By the 2 & 3 Ann. ch. 9 - - 0 6	Act - - - - - }
	Do. by this Act - - 1 0
	By 6 Geo. 2. ch. 13. beside } 2 0
	the above* - - - }
By the 21 Geo. 2. ch. 2 - - 1 6	By this Act - - - 3 0
By the 32 Geo. 2. ch. 10. - - 1 6	By this Act - - - 3 0
6 6	12 0
	* These two Shillings were given to compensate for the duty of 1 6 laid on in the 12 Cha. ch 4.

By the 5 Geo. 3d. the Acts from William are recited, the 12s. is declared to determine, and in lieu thereof is given - - - - - 14 6

Now the true drawback would have been 13s. 8d. of course the refiner had a bounty of 1s. 6d. above the true drawback.

This was done by Mr. Grenville, not as an equivalent drawback for the duties, but as a bounty to the West-India merchants, on his stopping the contraband trade to the Spanish main.

The duty on refined sugar being thus fixed at 1 4 4
instead of at - - - - - 15 8½

Gave the Irish refiner an advantage of 8 7½
But

But the mischief did not end here; for as there have been since several additional duties imposed upon raw sugar, the duty upon refined sugar has in every case, until the session 1797, been calculated upon the false principle of the first duty; and has increased the advantage of the Irish refiner in a multiplied ratio; so that when raw sugar was raised to

	-	-	-	-	13	4 $\frac{1}{2}$
Refined Sugar paid	-	-	-	-	1	16 9

Advantage to the Irish refiner	-	-	10	0 $\frac{1}{2}$
--------------------------------	---	---	----	-----------------

And when raw sugar was again raised to	-	16	3
--	---	----	---

Refined paid	-	-	-	2	4	8
--------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

Advantage to the Irish refiner	-	-	12	2
--------------------------------	---	---	----	---

Thus the Irish refiner got possession of a complete monopoly of the market, and he accordingly charged what price he chose for his sugars.

In session 1797, raw sugar was raised to 18s. 11 $\frac{1}{2}$ d., but Parliament being at length convinced of the error they were led into, by the evidence of the sugar refiners in 1780, refused to raise the duty on refined sugar, and in the course of the session, they, by Bill, lowered the duty on refined to 1l. 17s. 11d. on the ground that it took 200 lbs. of raw to make 100 wt. of refined sugar. Thus the duty on refined sugar being reduced from

	-	2	4	8
to	-	1	17	11

The advantage which the Irish refiner had of	-	12	2
--	---	----	---

was reduced in the sum of	-	6	9
---------------------------	---	---	---

Leaving him a profit of only	-	5	5
------------------------------	---	---	---

This statement is made on the supposition that my doctrine was right,—that the true equalizing duty was 3 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ as before stated.

Gentlemen

Gentlemen have often expressed their surprise at the cause of the high price of sugar; but I will shew them what a complete monopoly the sugar-bakers have had, and then their surprise will cease.

By our laws as they stand at this day the Irish sugar-baker has an advantage over the English refiner, of per 100 wt. - - 5 5

But he has still greater advantages from the present state of the British laws. In the year 1782, the duty on raw sugar in Britain was raised to English money - - - 11 8

And the bounty on export of refined was - 1 6 0

Whereby the refiner had an advantage of - 2 8

The next year the duty was raised to - 12 2

And the bounty remained as before at - 1 6 0

By this the advantage of the refiner was reduced to - 1 8

In 1788, the duty was raised to - 12 4

The bounty remained as before at - 1 6 0

By this the advantage of the English refiner was reduced to - 1 4

In 1793 the duty was raised to - 15 0

The bounty remained as before at - 1 6 0

The refiner then, instead of advantage, lost - 4 0

In 1796 the duty stood as before at 15 0

But the bounty was reduced to - 19 0

The refiner then lost - 11 0

In

In 1797, the duty was raised to	-	£ 0 17 6
And the bounty stood at	-	1 3 0
The refiner then lost	-	12 0
In 1799, the duty was raised to	-	18 2
And the bounty was reduced to	-	19 0
The refiner then lost	-	17 4
Thus the law stands at this day; and the English refiner loses on refined sugar sent to this country, a duty in Irish money		
	-	18 9½
Add to this the advantage the Irish sugar-baker has, as above stated of	-	5 5

And the Irish refiner is protected by £ 1 4 2½

This advantage which the Irish refiner has hitherto enjoyed, has depended entirely on the state of the drawback given in Great Britain, and by no means upon any compact made between Great Britain and Ireland. It was therefore in the power of the British Parliament, at any time, to have deprived the Irish refiner of such advantage.

Now how will the trade stand under the Articles of Union?

By the second Resolution of the sixth Article—refined sugar coming into this country from Britain, must come without duty or bounty, as being a manufacture of Britain.—By the fourth Resolution of the sixth Article, the raw material sugar being subject to a duty here, and refined sugar being for that reason one of the articles included in the schedule of countervailing duties, will be liable to a duty of £ 1 19 8½.

And so long as Britain did withhold any part of the full drawback, whatever was retained certainly was a protection to our refiners; but so soon as the Union shall take place,
Britain

Britain must give, by the fourth Resolution of the sixth Article, a drawback equal to the countervailing duty she imposes; and as the duties on the raw material are the same in both countries, so must the countervailing duties be equal; and of course, the drawback in England must be exactly equal to our countervailing duty.

This is the history of the sugar trade of this country; and it may afford an example to gentlemen, to shew them the consequence of reposing too implicit a confidence in the assertions of interested manufacturers, and of laying prohibitory duties upon articles of general consumption, and thereby giving a monopoly to men who know how to make use of it to their own advantage.

It is unnecessary for me to state, because every gentleman knows, that for twenty years we have been charged above 30 per cent. for our refined sugars above the price in the English market.

The next article is the iron manufacture as carried on in this country. Two witnesses were produced on this article, one of whom carries on the flitting and rolling of iron, making of spades, shovels, scythes, &c. very extensively; the other was an iron-monger dealing in English goods.

The first gentleman very fairly acknowledged that a protection of 10 per cent. was sufficient for him;—that his manufacture had been begun under the protecting duty of 10 per cent. had now established itself, and that he was contented with that protection.

The second gentleman's evidence was not material; he said that his business was much injured by the Proposition of Union, because that measure put a stop to building, and of course to his selling such articles as builders used to purchase, and particularly the sale of tools to carpenters; but
when

when I asked him, were the tools he sold them English or Irish, he confessed that they were English.

This was all the evidence given upon this subject; and on the whole of it I think it evident, that this manufacture is safe under the protection it will have of 10 per cent.

The next article is silk.

Two witnesses were examined on this branch of manufacture, Mr. Abbot and Mr. Geoghegan, who both agreed that the present duty was insufficient to protect their manufacture,—that the present duty, exclusive of the expense of importation, which they estimated at 3 per cent. was 13 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on the value, and that not less than 25 per cent. was sufficient to protect the silk manufacture—that it was in great prosperity twelve or thirteen years ago, when Mr. Abbot went into it.

That it was now a very declining trade, and particularly for the last three years, owing to the great increased importation of silken manufactures.

These gentlemen also stated that the English manufacturer had great advantages over the Irish—first, by machinery for throwing silk—secondly, by manufacturing in the *country*; whereas we work in *Dublin*, and pay *London* prices.

As to the first, we have machinery as well as they have for throwing silk, and we have a higher duty upon thrown silk than on organzined, to protect our throwster.—But if we chose to import either raw or thrown silk, we have a great *advantage* over England.—Raw silk imported into England pays in Irish money per lb. 16 oz. £ 0 3 6
Do. into Ireland per lb. of 24 oz. 1s. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. or on

16 oz.	-	-	-	1	1
Do. drawback in England 3s. 0 $\frac{1}{4}$ d. and leaves behind	0	6			
So that the Englishman pays duty	3	6			
For what the Irishman pays	-	1	7 $\frac{1}{2}$		
Difference in favour of Ireland,				1	11 $\frac{1}{2}$
or 55 per cent.				Thrown	

Thrown silk into England pays Irish money for

16 oz. - - - -	8 8½
Do. into Ireland for 16 oz. - -	4 2½
English drawback for 16 oz. 7s. 6d. leaves behind	1 2
So that the Englishman pays duty -	8 8½
The Irishman - - - -	5 4¼
Difference in favour of the Irish, -	3 4¼
or near £ 37 10 per cent.	
Thrown silk dyed pays into England -	1 9 6
Do. into Ireland - - - -	0 6 4½
English drawback £ 1 4s. 1¼d. leaves behind	0 5 5
So that the Englishman pays duty -	1 9 6
The Irishman - - - -	0 11 9½
Difference in favour of Irish, -	17 8½
or upwards of 60 per cent.	

Now as to the assertion that the manufacture is declining from the great increased quantity of the manufactured silk imported, and therefore that the trade requires higher duties to protect it, let us see how this assertion is supported by facts!

Mr. Abbot has been in the trade 12 years; when he came into it, he found it in a very flourishing and prosperous condition. At that time the duties were lower than they are at this day, by 2 ten per cents. upon the duties. The *trade* has declined, principally in the last 3 years; the very period in which these additional duties have been imposed!

Mr. Abbot alleges that this decline of trade is owing to the great *increased* importation of manufactured silks. Let us now see how this fact stands. Mr. Abbot found the trade flourishing in 1788, when he came into it.

There

There were imported of wrought silks in			lbs:
three years to 1788, on an average	1788		13,339
In 3 years to - - -	1790		10,265
In 3 years to - - -	1793		6,611
In 3 years to - - -	1796		4,664
In 3 years to - - -	1799		5,146

There were imported of raw silks, that is, unmanufactured silks, on an average of

three years to - - -	1788	88,835
In 3 years to - - -	1790	79,859
In 3 years to - - -	1793	86,203
In 3 years to - - -	1796	61,671
In 3 years to - - -	1799	65,266

From this statement, it is evident, that, instead of the quantity of *manufactured* silks imported, having increased, they have *decreased* considerably,—nearly two-thirds; while the *decreased* importation of *raw* silk is not one-third. Now what does this prove? In the first place, that it cannot be owing to the increased importation of wrought silks, that the trade has declined; and in the second place, that the raising the duty has not prevented the decline. So that Mr. Abbot is mistaken in both his assertions.

This statement, while it refutes the arguments used to shew the necessity of raising the duties; at the same time shews clearly to what the decline of the manufacture is owing, viz. To the decreased consumption of the article of silk manufactures.

It appears that the manufactured silks imported are decreased nearly two-thirds,—that the decrease in the raw material is not one-third,—both are decreased; of course the consumption is decreased—but this has not fallen so heavy on the Irish manufacturer as on the English.—See again how the English manufacturer importing ribbons and wrought silks into Ireland, is circumstanced, in regard to

F

drawbacks.

drawbacks. I will suppose that both the English and Irish manufacturer work upon imported *thrown* silk: in that case the Englishman pays duty on his silk as follows:

A pound of manufactured silk of 16 oz. will take $21\frac{1}{2}$ oz. of thrown silk, the duty on which is	-	£ 0 11 6 $\frac{1}{2}$
The drawback on exportation but	-	5 5

He will have paid therefore on this pound of manufactured silk in England	-	6 1 $\frac{1}{2}$
On import here the duty will be	-	9 6 $\frac{1}{2}$

So that the pound of manufactured silk from England will stand here at the duties of	-	15 8
--	---	------

The Irishman pays on $21\frac{1}{2}$ oz. of thrown silk contained in his pound of manufactured silk	-	5 7 $\frac{1}{2}$
And he leaves behind of drawback	-	1 6 $\frac{1}{2}$

Total	-	7 2 $\frac{1}{2}$
-------	---	-------------------

The total expence to the Englishman is	15 8
Do. to the Irishman	7 2 $\frac{1}{2}$

Advantage in favour of the Irishman	-	8 5 $\frac{1}{2}$
-------------------------------------	---	-------------------

Cotton is the next article.

It may be necessary for me here again to caution gentlemen, and to desire them to be on their guard, when they listen to the evidence of interested men, giving to this House information not upon oath: I mean not to give offence to any gentleman who has appeared upon this occasion: I only mean to say to this House, that it is extremely natural for men deeply interested in any business, to take alarm at any alteration whatever: that it is extremely natural for men, who are in possession, through prohibitory duties, of the monopoly of a market, to wish to preserve such monopoly: no one can blame them for such a partiality

tiality and attention to their own interest. Gentlemen may think that there is some weight in these observations, when they recollect that the evidence which was given in England, upon this same subject in 1785, by Englishmen, anxious to preserve this market, was in every particular the direct contradiction of the present evidence, and went to shew, with equal positiveness, that under a duty of 10*l.* 10*s.* their cotton trade must migrate to Ireland. Now both these statements cannot be true, being direct contradictions. I shall not here take upon me to determine which is right; but I must observe that the evidence given in the House of Lords in England was on oath, and that the witnesses were as respectable men as any in England. One of them, Mr. Peele, now a Member of the British Parliament, and a man who has distinguished himself by his liberality in subscribing no less than 10,000*l.* to the publick exigencies, this gentleman manifested the sincerity of his opinion, by actually coming to Ireland, in order to get into a house here, in case the Propositions had passed into a law.

But which ever of the parties may be right, certainly both cannot; and therefore this contradiction of evidence ought to convince gentlemen with what caution they should listen to interested men upon such subjects. Perhaps we may look for the truth between the extremes; and that the wisest course we can steer, will be to grant as much protection to this manufacture, as can be in reason desired, by, in the first place, continuing the present duties just as they stand, for a certain number of years, and then by diminishing these duties by slow degrees, until they shall come down to 10 per cent. at which they shall stand for the remainder of the 20 years. By this mode of proceeding, this manufacture will have three years of the protection they now enjoy; and by withdrawing the duties by degrees for eight years more, there will be every opportunity given to the
manufacture

manufacture of establishing itself; and if it cannot exist with such protection, it is very clear that it ought not to exist at all. It has had already for seventeen years a protection of 50 per cent. it will continue to have the same protection for three years longer, and it will take eight years more to reduce the duty to 10 per cent.; at which it will stand for ten years more. If it cannot establish itself in that time, it will be right to have done with it.

By this mode also, the manufacturers will have sufficient time to withdraw themselves and capitals from this manufacture, if they shall think proper: but I hope and trust, that this will not be the case; but that on the contrary, the manufacture will gain strength, and flourish. I am led to believe that this will be the case from the following circumstances: I find on the Journal of 1794, a petition presented by Messrs. Duffy and Orr, with many other spinners, manufacturers and printers of cottons, to the number of twenty-two, in which they state,

“ That the muslin and calico manufactures of Ireland
 “ were then nearly adequate to the home consumption;
 “ that the further extension of it was impeded by the *high*
 “ duty then existing upon cotton yarn; and that any addi-
 “ tional duty would prevent them from *meeting England* at
 “ a foreign market; but that if the cotton yarn was ad-
 “ mitted from England into Ireland free, as it is from
 “ Ireland into England, then any *impediment* to their ex-
 “ portation would be removed.”

A copy of this petition to Parliament was sent to me, inclosed in a letter from Messrs. Duffy and Orr, on behalf of themselves and twenty other Houses engaged in this manufacture, which letter concludes with the following paragraph:

“ Several who have signed the petition are spinners as
 “ well as manufacturers; and it is from a thorough convic-
 “ tion,

“ tion, that if the prayer of their petition is granted, the
 “ muslin and calico manufacture of this kingdom will
 “ flourish and prove a fresh source of national prosperity,
 “ that they presume to solicit your support.”

Now, gentlemen will be pleased to observe, that this petition, signed by two of the principal evidences who have appeared at your bar, states the manufacture to be flourishing, and to be not only in possession of the Irish market, but that, with the aid of the import of English yarn duty free, they would be enabled to meet *England* at a *foreign* market.

It must be evident, that if they were enabled to meet *England* in a *foreign* market, merely by removing the duty on cotton yarn, they must be much *more able* to meet her in their *own market*; and if they were able to meet her in their own markets, it could not require a protecting duty of 50 per cent. to keep *England* out of this market.

Now, what is the doctrine of this day? Why, that we must have a protecting duty upon the raw material or yarn, in order to protect the mills, and also, a protecting duty upon the finished goods to protect the manufacturer.

How is this difference of opinion to be reconciled, unless it should appear that the persons so differing in their opinions should have erected spinning mills between the time they first gave their opinions and the present period?

Now, whether the contradiction given by the witnesses in *England*, on their oaths, to the evidence given here will have weight with gentlemen or not, I cannot take upon me to say; but if it has not, surely this contradiction of the evidence of the present day by the witnesses themselves, at another period, must shew, that much caution is necessary to be used in judging upon what they say, and ought to make gentlemen cautious of giving entire credit to opinions biased by interested motives.

Now see how the argument will stand according to the allegations of the petition just stated, and also according to
 the

the evidence before us, which states that "yarn and twist
"and plain white calicos can be imported cheaper from
"England than they can be manufactured here."

First, as to the manufacturer of calicos.

Calicos are made of yarn and twist.

These can be bought cheaper if imported from England,
than they can be had for here; therefore the manufac-
turer can make his web of calico cheaper of English, than
of Irish yarn and twist.

Secondly, as to the printer of calicos. White calicos
can be made cheaper here of English, than of Irish yarn;
therefore the printer, who is to print these calicos, can
obtain more by buying those calicos so made, than those
made of Irish yarn.

Again, English white calicos can undersel Irish; there-
fore, the printer can get calicos cheaper to buy for printing,
by taking off the duties on imported calicos, than he does now.

Therefore, if the duty were taken off both twist and
calico, not only the manufacturer, but likewise the printer,
and of course the consumer, would be benefited.

How happens it then that the printers come forward and
say, that their trade will be ruined by their being enabled
to buy the calicos they are to print cheaper than they do
at this day?

Now to view this subject in another light;—that is,
whether, the cotton trade be advantageous to this coun-
try or otherwise?

According to all the evidence, the cottons consumed
annually in Ireland, are in value from 700,000 to £800,000
The cost of the labour is stated at

		500,000
Remains	-	300,000
Deduct value of raw materials	-	100,000
Remains profit	-	200,000
		New

Now the consumer paying at the rate of 50 per cent. on £800,000 pays £400,000 in order to give a profit of £200,000 to the manufacturers; that is 200 per cent. on the profit.

In a system of Union, prohibition, or prohibitory duties are inadmissible between the parties.

In us it would be impolitic and unwise. $\frac{3}{4}$ of our exports go to Britain, and $\frac{1}{4}$ of our imports come from thence; a war of duties and bounties would therefore be ruinous to us.

We export to Britain annually, linen to	
the amount of	£2,600,000
And of provisions	2,900,000
Total	5,500,000

These all go into Britain free from duty there: and shall we not be content with a protecting duty of ten per cent. together with the expences of importation, being, I suppose, 5 per cent. more? Shall we not, I say, be contented with 15 per cent. protection; and shall we talk of prohibiting duties? And that in favour of a manufacture which, it is said, cannot be supported without forcing the consumers to pay 50 per cent. upon their consumption, and which taxes the nation in the yearly sum of £400,000.

I have taken up too much of the time of the House; I thank them for the indulgence I have received; and shall now beg leave to move the first Resolution.

FINIS

NEW PUBLICATIONS,

PRINTED FOR JOHN MILLIKEN, 32, GRAFTON-STREET.

1. SPEECH of the Right Hon. JOHN, Earl of CLARE, Lord High Chancellor of Ireland, in the House of Lords of Ireland, Monday, February 10, 1800, relative to an INCORPORATING UNION between Great Britain and Ireland. Published by AUTHORITY. 2s. 2d.

2. SPEECH of the Right Hon. JOHN, Lord Baron FITZGIBBON, (now Earl of CLARE) Lord High Chancellor of Ireland, delivered in the House of Peers of Ireland, on the Second Reading of the Bill for the Relief of the Roman Catholics, March 13, 1793: with an accurate Report of the SPEECH of the Right Hon. JOHN FOSTER, Speaker of the House of Commons, on the same Subject. 1s. 7½d.

3. SPEECH of the Right Hon. JOHN, Earl of CLARE, Lord High Chancellor of Ireland, in the House of Lords of Ireland, Monday, February 19, 1798, on the Motion of the Earl of Moira, for adopting conciliatory Measures, &c. &c. With an APPENDIX, containing Original Papers referred to in the Course of the Speech. Third Edition. 1s. 7½d.

4. SPEECH of the Right Hon. BARRY, Lord YELVERTON, Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer in the House of Lords, Saturday, March 22, 1800, relative to an INCORPORATING UNION. 1s. 1d.

5. SPEECH of the Right Hon. Lord Viscount CASTLE-REAGH, in the House of Commons, Wednesday, February 5, 1800, on offering to the House certain RESOLUTIONS, proposing and recommending a complete and entire UNION between GREAT BRITAIN & IRELAND. 1s. 1d.

6. SPEECH of PATRICK DUIGENAN, L. L. D. in the House of Commons, Wednesday, February 5, 1800, on the Subject of an INCORPORATING UNION between Great Britain and Ireland. 1s. 1d.

✪ A few complete Sets of ALL THE PAMPHLETS relative to an INCORPORATING UNION between Great Britain and Ireland, in Eight very large Volumes Octavo, may be had, neatly bound, at MILLIKEN's, 32, GRAFTON-STREET.

